



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/875,660	06/05/2001	Byron Lambert	ACS-58284 (1931P)	7403

24201 7590 04/03/2003

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6060 CENTER DRIVE
TENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

PHAM, HAI CHI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2861

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/875,660

Applicant(s)

LAMBERT ET AL

Examiner

Hai C Pham

Art Unit

2861

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hai C Pham.

(3) _____.

(2) Richard Salfelder, Attorney.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: April 1st, 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,5,6,11,31 and 42.

Identification of prior art discussed: Murray et al. (U.S. 3,709,794).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Hai C Pham

HAI PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

4/2/03

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants' Representative argues that the main reference, Murray et al., is not directed to a sterilization system, that the reference does not disclose a radiation source as well as the repetiting steps being performed during the determination of the radiation dose. Firstly, the current invention is directed to a method and system for determining a radiation dose for quality control of a radiation process, where the dosimetry for the sterilization of medical products is one particular application. Therefore, the recitation of the claimed apparatus, which is intended to be employed, is not differentiated from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Secondly, the main reference teaches a radiation dose determination based on the change in temperature produced by an incident radiation, which necessary implies the use of an incident radiation source, namely an X-ray generation source. Thirdly, although the main reference lacks the repetitive stpes of measuring the temperature change due to the incident radiation, such limitation is not uniformly recited in all the above mentioned base claims, namely claims 1, 6, and 31 lack such feature. Applicants' Representative will amend these claims to include the repetitive control steps to overcome the prior art.